

Application No. 10/673,349  
MR1035-1318  
Reply to Office Action of 20 July 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 20 July 2004. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 have been amended to clarify and correct the language thereof.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1—7 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner kindly pointed out 3 instances in the Claims in which the word “potentiostatic” should have read “potentiostat”; further identified was the use in Claim 5 of “50 W, 11000 to 20000 Lx” instead of “11,000 to 20,000 lux.”

Accordingly, all of the above corrections have been made and are reflected in the currently amended claims. It is now believed that the Claims have been corrected to obviate any 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph problems, and that the Claims as currently amended particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention.

It is thus believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested

Respectfully submitted,  
(for Rosenberg, Klein & Lee)



Harry L. Sernaker  
Registration #50,595

Dated: 24 August 2004

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465 - 6678